

REMARKS

The Office examined claims 1-15 and rejected same. With this paper, no claims are amended, added or cancelled so that claims 1-15 remain in the application.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §103

At sections 3-4 of the Office action, claims 1, 4, 5, 8-11 & 14-15 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US patent publication 2003/0174160 (hereinafter Deutscher) in view of US patent publication 2004/0130566 (hereinafter Banerjee) in view of US patent 7,149,755 (hereinafter Obrador). Of these, claims 1, 5 and 11 are independent claims.

The invention as recited in the independent claims comprises a method as well as an apparatus for enacting the method, which comprises:

assembling in a first column a plurality of objects of a slide that are to be displayed successively one after the other when a multimedia presentation is played on a communication or computing terminal having a display device, and also assembling in a second column any and all objects of the slide that are to be displayed in parallel with and side-by-side with any of the objects of the first column when the presentation is played; and

displaying at the same time the first and second column side-by-side on the display device in the same horizontal arrangement as the objects will be displayed when the presentation is played, for editing by a user.

As to independent claims 1, 5 and 11, relying on Deutscher Figure 8 and paras. [0062]-[0065], the Office asserts that Deutscher teaches "assembling a plurality of objects of a slide that are to be displayed successively one after the other when a multimedia presentation is played on a communication or computing terminal having a display device, and displaying at

the same time the first and second column side-by-side on the display device in the same horizontal arrangement as the objects will be displayed when the presentation is played."

The invention as claimed in independent claims 1, 5 and 11 also requires that the display be provided in such a way as to allow editing. The Office relies on Figure 4 and paras. [0017]-[0020] of Banerjee for disclosing "displaying objects of a slide in parallel for editing by a user."

Furthermore, the claimed invention requires that any and all objects of the slide that are to be displayed in parallel with and side-by-side with any of the objects of the first column when the presentation is played be assembled in a second column. The Office relies on Figures 10A-10C of Obrador for disclosing "assembling in a first and second column any and all object of the slide that are to be displayed in parallel with and side-by-side with any of the objects of the first column when the presentation is played."

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office's assertion that the combination of Deutscher, Banerjee and Obrador discloses the invention as claimed for the following reasons.

As explained in the previous response, the invention as claimed is most quickly comprehended by reference to Figure 2, which shows a block diagram of a multimedia presentation of a plurality of slides, each of which includes various media components; in Figure 2, only Slide 1 is shown to include media components, including text, images, and an audio clip. According to the invention, the different media components are provided in different columns, to facilitate editing.

It is essential to understand that the claimed invention

recites features that are utilized during editing by a user, and only after editing is the presentation played. This is shown in the invention as in claim 1 (and substantially similarly in claims 5 and 11). The claimed invention clearly indicates that the objects located in the first and second column are to be displayed when a multimedia presentation is played, i.e. in the future, but that the displaying of the columns on the display, i.e. in the present, is for editing by a user.

As illustrated in the block diagram of Figure 2 (and explained in the application text as originally filed at page 7, line 20 through page 8, line 29), during the actual playing of a slide of the presentation, if certain text is to be displayed throughout the entire time the slide is displayed while several different images are displayed in succession during actual playing, all the images are displayed by the invention in one column (25b), one on top of the other, and the (fixed or constant) text is displayed in another column (25a) beside the column displaying the images. When the presentation is actually played, the screen viewed by a user will display the text for the slide the entire time the slide displays, and will display the images individually, one after the other, so that only one image is displayed on the screen at any one time. (See Figures 3 and 4B.)

Moreover, Figure 2 also illustrates the feature of the claimed invention wherein the displayable objects are arranged in side-by-side first and second columns in the same horizontal arrangement as the objects will be displayed when the presentation is played. In other words, in the example shown in Figure 2, the slide which is displayed during actual playing will have (fixed or constant) text (22) located on the left portion of the screen, while on the right portion of the screen

three separate images (23a, 23b, 23c) will be shown successively in the manner described above, since the first column (25a) is located to the left of the second column (25b).

In contrast, Deutscher at paras. [0062]-[0065] teaches a "window layout" of an interactive presentation viewing system, i.e. a screen having several different windows. The window layout described at paras. [0062]-[0065] or elsewhere in the reference is not explained as including a plurality of objects that are *to be displayed successively, one after the other, during a presentation*, as required by the claimed invention. What is described in Deutscher is a "playback space" window 204, also referred to as a presentation video sector window, for viewing a "video presentation," and a "slide presentation sector" window 214 "for displaying presentation slides associated with the video presentation." The screen may have other windows, including a video selector window 202, and a video player controls area window 208. Deutscher further discloses a window for automatically displaying the transcript segment associated with the portion of the program then being played in the presentation video sector/ playback space, as indicated by an elapsed running time assigned to the segment.

Contrary to the claimed invention, what Deutscher therefore discloses is a window layout for playing a presentation including an audio or video presentation, and does not disclose a plurality of objects of a slide that are to be displayed successively one after the other when a presentation is played, nor does it disclose displaying at the same time the first and second columns side-by-side on the display device in the same horizontal arrangement as the objects will be displayed when the presentation is played, as required by the independent claims. As Deutscher does not disclose an editing environment, it cannot

disclose or suggest first and second columns that contain objects to be displayed when a presentation is played and further that the columns being displayed side-by-side in the same horizontal arrangement as the objects will be displayed when the presentation is played. Inherently, the term "same" indicates a comparison between two things; in this case two arrangements - one in an editing environment and one in a playback environment. Deutscher discloses an environment in which the presentation is already being played, consequently Deutscher cannot teach that there is a "sameness" between the horizontal arrangement in the editing environment and the horizontal arrangement in the playing environment. As such, Deutscher cannot fairly be said to disclose the features of the independent claims deemed unpatentable by the Office, in particular "displaying at the same time the first and second columns side-by-side on the display device in the same horizontal arrangement as the objects will be displayed when the presentation is played."

Although the Office only relies upon Banerjee for the limitation of displaying a slide in parallel for editing by a user, Applicant observes that Banerjee also fails to disclose the features that are lacking in Deutscher, i.e. "displaying at the same time the first and second column side-by-side on the display device in the same horizontal arrangement as the objects will be displayed when the presentation is played," as required by the claimed invention. Rather, Figure 4 of Banerjee teaches 3D Actors having various associated linear event triggers. Although the 3D Actors may be toggled on and off, this is clearly not the same as the claimed invention. There is simply no teaching or suggestion that the 3D Actor columns are displayed at the same time side-by-side on the display device in the same horizontal arrangement as the objects will be displayed

when the presentation is played. Indeed, in order for two or more 3D Actors to be displayed side-by-side on the display device in the same horizontal arrangement as the objects will be displayed, the user-configurable 3D Actor events would have to occupy at least a portion of the same column. Thus, although Banerjee teaches an environment in which editing by a user is possible, one of ordinary skill in the art would not combine Banerjee with Deutscher to arrive at the claimed invention as both references fail to disclose essential features of the invention described above.

The Office further cites Figures 10A-10C of Obrador for disclosing "assembling in a first and second column any and all objects of the slide that are to be displayed in parallel with and side-by-side with any of the objects of the first column when the presentation is played." In the cited figures, Obrador discloses a media album page having an image in one column and text or images in another column. However, Obrador fails to disclose the features of the claimed invention that are lacking in Deutscher and Banerjee, namely "displaying at the same time the first and second column side-by-side on the display device in the same horizontal arrangement as the objects will be displayed when the presentation is played." Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that combining the arrangement disclosed in Obrador with the editing environment of Banerjee and the window layout of Deutscher would not result in the suggestion or disclosure of all the features of the claimed invention. Thus, the references, taken singly or in combination, do not disclose or suggest "displaying at the same time the first and second column side-by-side on the display device in the same horizontal arrangement as the objects will be displayed when the presentation is played," as claimed.

In view of the above reasoning, as no combination of the applied references discloses or suggests every limitation of the independent claims, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 1, 5 and 11 under 35 USC §103 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 4 and 8 are ultimately dependent from independent claims 1 and 5 and recite additional features not recited in claims 1 and 5. In view of the above reasoning, and at least in view of their dependencies, claims 4 and 8 are also patentable over Deutscher in view of Banerjee in view of Obrador. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 4 and 8 under 35 USC §103 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

At section 5 of the Office action, claims 2, 3, 6-7 and 12-13 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deutscher and Banerjee in view of Obrador in view of US patent publication 2006/0168619 (hereinafter Reams).

Applicant respectfully submits that Reams is not a valid prior art reference as its filing date is December 27, 2005, two years after the filing date of the claimed invention. Reams is a Continuation-in-Part application claiming priority to its parent application, filed April 20, 2001, however, the cited passages relied upon by the Office in the current rejection contain new disclosure that is not included in the parent application. As such, the priority date of the cited passages is December 27, 2005 and not April 20, 2001, therefore, Reams is not a valid reference.

Furthermore, an important embodiment of the invention as recited in claim 3 requires that "a synchronized multimedia

integration language is used to prescribe how the multimedia presentation is to be played, and the objects in the first column displayed for editing are the objects included in a sequential time container within a parallel time container of a code fragment according to the synchronized multimedia integration language." Deutscher, Banerjee and Obrador, taken singly or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest this feature of the claimed invention.

At least in view of the inapplicability of Reams, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2, 3, 6-7 and 12-13 are allowable and requests that the rejections of claims 2, 3, 6-7 and 12-13 under 35 USC §103 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For all the foregoing reasons it is believed that all of the claims of the application are in condition for allowance and their passage to issue is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/June 12, 2008/
Date

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468-0224

/Cathy A. Sturmer/
Cathy A. Sturmer
Agent for the Applicant
Registration No. 60,869

tel: (203) 261-1234
Cust. No.: 004955